



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. Ionic. By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Ph. D. University of Göttingen, Professor of Greek in Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1894. xxviii + 668 pp.

In spite of the fact that the Ionic dialect is surpassed in literary importance by the Attic only, no comprehensive work on it has appeared since the last edition of Maittaire's '*Graecae linguae dialecti*' in 1807. The peculiar difficulties attending a satisfactory and scientific treatment of the Ionic, and perhaps also the greater interest, from a comparative point of view, of some of the other dialects, have apparently induced the three successors of Maittaire to make the Ionic the subject of the as yet unpublished concluding volumes of their respective series. For deviating from this habit of his predecessors and for thus giving us what may be properly called the first scientific Ionic grammar, the author is entitled to the hearty thanks not only of those who are engaged in the comparative study of Greek dialects, but also of the larger number of those whose work is in the text-criticism of the various Ionic writers, and to whom he has given a firm basis on which to stand.

Those who are familiar with the author's former contributions to Greek dialectology (in the Transactions of the American Philological Association and in this JOURNAL) need not be told that conscientious care and painstaking accuracy, extensive knowledge and clear presentation characterize this last and, in size and importance, greatest work, as they did its smaller precursors.

For a book embodying, as this one does, the results of long-extended collections, use is the only thorough and fair test. In the short time that has elapsed since its publication, only he could successfully attempt an exhaustive review who should happen to have gone over the same ground. All that I can now do is to give a brief summary of the whole, set forth its general structure, and finally discuss somewhat more in detail a point here and there in the part on phonology.

The Preface on twenty-seven pages gives, after a general introduction, an enumeration of the chief works cited and referred to (20 pp.). In the very full list we miss Prellwitz's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (1892),<sup>1</sup> which would have offered a number of valuable etymological and phonological suggestions. The remainder of the Preface is taken up with a list of the editions used and of the MSS which are of importance in constituting the text of the Ionic authors.

The Introduction (about one-fourth of the whole) deals with the three sources of our knowledge of the dialect, viz. the literary monuments, the

<sup>1</sup>Fick's detailed review in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1894, No. III, pp. 227-48, appeared too late for use in the present volume.

inscriptions, and the grammarians; the main geographical divisions of the Ionic, together with the statements of the ancients on this point; the determination of subdialects; the chronological divisions; the Ionic element in Homer; the relation of Old to New Ionic; the Ionic element in the iambic, trochaic, elegiac and melic poetry; the relation of Old Attic to Ionic; the Ionisms of Attic tragedy and comedy; the pure and mixed Ionic; the dialect of the Ionic philosophers, of Herodotus, and of Hippocrates; finally, Pseudo-Ionism and its writers.

A little less than a fourth of the work is given to phonology, somewhat less than half to morphology. Additions and corrections fill twenty pages, and about thirty pages of indexes conclude the book.

The method of treatment has several characteristic features, all of which deserve special notice and commendation; viz. (1) the clear line of division which is drawn and maintained throughout between the material yielded by the inscriptions and that offered by the texts; (2) regarding the latter, the careful consideration of the MS authority for any given reading—a task much more difficult than it may seem, on account of the lack of suitable editions for not a few of the texts, of which the author complains (p. viii): "Much of Ionic literature is still inadequately edited. Of Hippokrates, Aretaïos, the philosophers (except Herakleitos) and the logographers there are no editions which record fully and faithfully the readings of the MSS. In the case of the philosophers only was I able in part to reconstruct my own texts, thanks to such books as Diels' *Simplicius* and Wachsmuth's *Stobaeus*"; (3) the constant endeavor to emphasize local differentiations, and thereby to establish sub-dialectic boundary lines; (4) the regard paid to chronology in the various dialectic and subdialectic developments, which is especially apparent in the carefully tabulated synopses of cases and verb-forms in the morphological part; (5) the exhaustive use made of whatever material may be gleaned from the grammarians, to which are due some very interesting and acute observations, such as (§413) a list of nouns of which the gender in Ionic differs from that in the Attic, or (p. 32) a collection of words peculiar to the Ionic vocabulary.

The method which he has followed in the treatment of the phonetic phenomena, the author has stated with commendable clearness in two passages of the Preface: "The present work attempts to combine the two methods by which dialectal phenomena may be studied, the philological and the linguistic [i. e. the descriptive and the comparative]. Primary importance has been attached to the point of view of Philology, which seeks among other things to determine on the basis of tradition the forms proper to the dialect of each author, the place occupied by him in the history of development of the dialect, the interrelation of the various connected styles of literary composition, and the connection between the language of artistic construction and the language of the public and private documents preserved in the inscriptions" (p. viii). And again: "As it has not been my purpose to write a Comparative Grammar from the point of view of the Ionic, I have rarely endeavoured to trace the forms to the prehellenic stage. Ionic has been compared throughout with other dialects, especially Attic. Because of its *μετρώτης* and *κοινότης* Attic is, and will continue to be, the standard by which

all philologists measure the manifold 'aberrations' of dialects less highly developed, or less adapted than itself to serve as vehicles for the expression of Hellenic thought" (p. ix). Now, while there can be no doubt regarding the absolute necessity of a most minute and (to use the terminology of the author) 'philological' investigation of the facts of each dialect, entirely independent of any comparison whatever, without which as a firm basis—we need not look far for ample proofs—any attempt at a comparative treatment must necessarily fail, it may be reasonably questioned, on the other hand, whether, by refusing to look at these phenomena from the comparative point of view, the investigator does not voluntarily handicap himself, and whether the grouping of his facts will not thereby become more superficial than if he had availed himself of the help of the comparative method. For, if there are cases in which the two kinds of treatment conflict, they are certainly rare, and in general only advantage can be derived from a comparative treatment, which is really nothing but the historical method in its last consequences, while the failure to make the comparative element sufficiently important leads to a number of more or less serious inconveniences. Of these the following two deserve especial mention.

In the comparison of two or more dialects we may distinguish two classes of phonetic differences, viz. (1) where *one* parental form, *A*, develops in two different directions, giving in two dialects two phonetically different reflexes, *A'* and *A''*. Here belong also those cases in which one dialect has retained the parental form, while others have changed it. An example is the treatment of Parent Greek *-ov* + *σ*, which appears now as *-ovσ*, now as *-ovσ*, now as *-ωσ*, and again is retained as *-ovσ*. (2) Where the form of a given word in one dialect differs from that in another dialect, because the two are to be referred back to *two different* parental forms; as, for instance, the one may be the reflex of a strong, the other that of a weak parental form. Of this description is, e. g., the relation of *κρέτος* in one dialect to *κράτος* in another, the former going back to the strong, the latter to the weak parental stem-form. Consequently, we cannot compare the *ε* of the one with the *α* of the other, as we compare the *η* of Ionic *μήτηρ* with the *ᾱ* of Doric *μῆτηρ*. The former class of dialectic changes are always and necessarily *phonetic* characteristics of the dialect in which they appear; this is not the case in the dialectic differences of the second group; so, in the example given, the representation of a Parent Greek *ᾱ* (*ῥ*) by *ρα* is no *phonetic* peculiarity of the Ionic, but common to almost all Greek dialects. The Ionic peculiarity here is purely *morphological*, in that it chose the weak stem-form where other dialects preferred the strong one. Now, if it is granted that the two should be kept apart, it is at the same time apparent that this can be done only by tracing dialectic forms at least to the Parent Greek stage.

The second inconvenience is that the disregard of comparative treatment will often bring together what has no organic connection, while it will separate what belongs closely together. So it is evidently not commendable to separate the discussion of *ῥ* (*ῥ*) reflected by *ορ*, *ρο* (§147) from that of the same sound reflected by *αρ*, *ρα*; and Ionic *κράτος*: Aeol. *κρέτος* (§128) belongs with Ionic *ἐρσην*: Att. *ἔρσην* (§134). Again, following §128, "Ionic *α* in conjunction with *ρ*" (as in *κράτος*, *θάρος*, etc., all weak forms of *er*-roots), we have in §129

"Other forms with *a* parallel to *e*." In this come first two words with *a* from *an* (*η*), viz. *τάμνω* and *μέγισθος*. But these deserved a separate class, corresponding to the separate paragraph for *ap* from *ar* (*ζ*), or both changes should be grouped together under the common head of weakenings of *e* + liquid or nasal roots. They certainly should not be thrown together with cases like *Ἀγβάτανα* : *Ἐκβάτανα* and some others of more doubtful character. The chapters which deal with the vexed question of the Greek reflexes of labialized gutturals, on which light has only just begun to be cast by Bezenberger (BB. XVI 234), Bechtel (Hauptprobleme, 352), Fick (BB. XVI 279 and XVIII 132) and Buck (IF. IV 152), have also suffered by this self-imposed abstinence from introducing the comparative method. Here, if anywhere, it was desirable that forms like *Κυανοψιών* and *Πυανοψιών* (§344) should not simply be placed side by side, but the former was to be shown to be the regular one, while the latter calls for an explanation of its *π* before the *υ* (which Bechtel, l. c. 362, has attempted). The same is true for *Τελέθριον* and *Πελεθρόνιον* and others; cf. Bechtel, l. c. 357, note. Here too an arrangement which treats the sounds under the heads of gutturals, labials and dentals, irrespective of their origin, and in these separates the surds, sonants and aspirates as chief subdivisions, will necessarily complicate matters and obscure the true genetic relations of the sounds in question; at the best it would call for many unnecessary repetitions.

I close with a few minor points that I have noted in the part on phonology.

§129 (p. 134). After the discussions of Bechtel and Möller (Zt. f. deut. Philol. XXV (1893) 370), it would seem better, before vowels at least, to write *τρμοντ-* rather than *τρημοντ-*.

§128. Attention is very properly called to the fact that the weak forms of the stem *kert* (*κρέτος*) cannot have arisen in the genitive from a form *\*κρτεσ-ός*, because neither the Greek nor the Sanskrit *s*-stems accent the genitive ending. But the assumption that *κράτος* and *θάρος* are formed after the analogy of *κρατής*, *θρασύς* fails to account for *πάθος* (: *πένθος*), Latin *vulnus* (Brugmann, Grundr. II 1, p. 387, end). An original variation of accent (preserved in Sanskrit, Whitney, Gr., §417) still seems the preferable explanation.

§128 (p. 133). The second *a* of *βάραθρον* (against *βέρεθρον*) finds its explanation by classing the stem with those discussed by Fick, Gött. Gel. Anz. 1881, p. 1425, viz. *βερε-* to *\*βερα* (whence the weak form *\*βαρα* < *βαρα-*) as *τεμε-* (*τέμενοι*) to *τεμα-* (*τεμαχός*), *γελε-* (*γελέοντες*) to *γελα-* (*γελάσσαι*), etc.

§130. There is no reason to doubt that *ἀμφισβητέω* and *-βᾶτέω* stand in *ablaut* relation; cf. the instances given by Bechtel, l. c. 241, to which may be added *τίθημι* : *θαμά* and *λήμα* : *λῶοργός* (Hesych.).

In §132 (p. 138), where *κυλ-* and *καλ-* (in *κυλίνδω*, *καλυνδέω*) are correctly explained as weak forms of a stem *qel*, the loss of labialization before the *a* deserves a word of comment, in view of cases like *σπάτος* : *σκύτος* ; *σπάζει* : *σκυζῶ* ; *ἀσπιλον* : *σπίλος* (Fick, BB. VIII 134 ff.). Similar cases of loss are *σκάλοψ* : *σπάλαξ* ; *κάπος* : Lith. *kewerpiú* ; *καρπός* 'wrist' : *kwarf* : *κύρβις*, etc.; cf. Bechtel, l. c. 353 ff.

§134 (p. 140). That *ἐτερος* (against *ἄτερος*) is morphologically considered the later form, its initial *ε* being due to the influence of the *ε* in the following syllable, is not so certain as it might appear from the statement in this

paragraph. Brugmann (Grundr. II 1, p. 181), Prellwitz (Etym. Wörterb., s. v.) and Persson (Stud. etym. 102) offer different explanations.

§164 (*μᾶλλον, ἐλάσσον, θᾶσσον*). The only phonetically clear form of this type is *ᾶσσον* from \**ᾶγχιον* (an *a*-stem), with compensatory lengthening of the *ᾶ* after the loss of the nasal. As the loss of the nasal took place after the law by which *ā* passed into *η* had expired, the *ā* is retained (in Attic and Ionic), as in *πᾶσα* (§161). But even if, with J. Schmidt, we derive *θᾶσσον* and *ἐλάσσον* from the intermediate forms \**θᾶγχιον* and \**ἐλᾶγχιον*, assuming them to stand for \**θέγγχιον* and \**ἐλέγγχιον* by analogy to *ταχύς* and *ἐλαχύς*, there remains without satisfactory explanation not only *μᾶλλον*, but also *μᾶσσον* from *μᾶκ-ρός*, against *μήκιστος*.

§165. For *γλασσα* (nine times in Herondas) *ᾱ* is probably to be assumed; the relation of the *a* to the *ω*, however, is not quite clear; cf. H. Collitz, *The Aryan Name of the Tongue*, in *Orient. Stud. of the Orient. Club of Philadelphia* (1894), p. 200.

§245. For the (late) loss of the second member of the diphthong *av* before consonants compare the instances in Attic and Peloponnesian inscriptions and Latin parallels in the Rhein. Mus. XVII 303; XVIII 142 and 147; XXIII 668.

§§341-3. In the very detailed discussion of Ionic *κο- : πο-* (in the pronoun), the noteworthy attempt to explain the loss of labialization as due to enclitic position (cf. the similar relation of *τοί* and *σοί*) should have been mentioned.

Finally I would note the peculiarly narrow sense in which the author uses the term *ablaut*, restricting it—in the case of *ε*-stems—to the *ε*- and *ο*-grades only, and thus contrasting them with the weak grade; as when he says on p. 133, "in verbal inflection, whenever *op* occurs, it is the *ablaut* of *ep*, not equal to the Aiolic form of *ap*," and again on p. 153, "in *διέφθορα op* is the *ablaut* of *ep*," as contrasted with the *op* = *ap pa* as reflex of *ar* (*r*). Surely there seems to be no good ground for not calling the relation of *ar* (*r*) to *er* by the same name as that of *er* to *or*.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

HANNS ORTEL.

Le Odi di Pindaro, dichiarate e tradotte da GIUSEPPE FRACCAROLI. Verona, G. Franchini, 1894.

Ueber die Wichtigkeit, die gegenwärtigen Richtungen und die Aufgaben der Pindar-Studien. Von HUGO JURENKA. (Verhandlungen der 42. Philologenversammlung.) Wien, 1893.

Novae lectiones Pindaricae. Scripsit HUGO JURENKA. Aus: Wiener Studien, Bd. IX. 1893.

It is not many years since Croiset's elaborate work on Pindar reached a well-deserved second edition, and the appearance in 1894 of a quarto of over seven hundred pages on the same little read though highly honored Greek poet is additional evidence, and welcome evidence, of the vitality of studies over which the funeral service has been read scores of times. The author of this remarkable contribution to Pindaric study is no novice in this line of work, and the name of Professor Fraccaroli is well known to those who have watched with sympathetic interest the labors of Italian scholars in the domain